

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,424	08/05/2003	Mohammad M. Samii	200205843-6	7791
75	590 03/29/2006	EXAMINER		
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			NGUYEN, LAM S	
Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			2853	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/634,424	SAMII, MOHAMMAI	D M.		
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
*	LAM S. NGUYEN	2853			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	orrespondence add	lress		
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.			
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the folk places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:  The period for raphy expires.	owing replies: (1) an amendment, af lotice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in nce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this</li> </ul>		in the final rejection, wh	ichever is later. In		
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN					
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	706.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of eunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lat may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(INOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ext	extension and the corresponding amount is shortened statutory period for reply originer than three months after the mailing date).  Inclinance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be the ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	of the fee. The appropr pinally set in the final Offiate of the final rejection, of filed within two months a avoid dismissal of the	riate extension fee ice action; or (2) as even if timely filed, hs of the date of		
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be file	d within the time period set forth in 3	37 CFR 41.37(a).			
AMENDMENTS					
<ul> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection</li> <li>(a)  They raise new issues that would require further c</li> <li>(b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE bel</li> <li>(c)  They are not deemed to place the application in both</li> </ul>	onsideration and/or search (see NO low);	TE below);			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	a corresponding number of finally re	iected claims.			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pr The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14, 23</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.  The office of the contract of the cont	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe rry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanati REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attact	ned.		
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	,		nce because:		
12. \(\sumsymbol{\substack}\) Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)	. (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	۷o(s).			

13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references in the cited prior art, the examiner again cites that a suggestion/motivation need not be expressly stated in one or all of the references used to show obviousness, but can be from common knowledge and common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference (In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 1390, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969). In this case, in order to avoid wiring disconnection between the printhead carrier and the printing system due to the moving forward/backward of the carrier, one of ordinary skill in the art would know to replace wiring connection by wireless connection, particularly optical connection.

The applicant even though introduces another established precedent to assert that the motivation for combination must be in the prior art (Karsten Manufacturing Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co., 58 U.S.P.Q.2d 1286, 1293 (CAFC 2001)), the applicant ignored the established precedent introduced by the examiner and did not explain why such established precedent can not be applied in this case.

Moreover, the applicant asserted that the combination would change the principle of operation of the prior art. The examiner disagrees with the applicant's assertion because one of ordinary skill in the art would know that in order to replace a wiring connection by a wireless connection such as optical communication, optical receivers such as photosensors are needed for converting optical signal to electrical signal. This modification does not change or ruin the principle of operation of the printhead because the principle operation of the pinthead is to convert received image data to printed images on a printing medium. In fact, the modification just changes the way to transmit and receive image data.

03/24/08

HAI PHAM PRIMARY EXAMINER

HailliPhen